



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,823	07/24/2006	Peter Kinast	19497-002US1	8435
26191	7590	02/04/2009	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			CARPENTER, WILLIAM R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3767	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/04/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/542,823	KINAST ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	WILLIAM CARPENTER	3767	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 56-106 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 87-106 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 56-86 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 61, 63, and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding Claim 61, Applicant recites the limitation "wherein the point-shaped edge". However, this limitation is improper as the "point-shaped edge", originally references in Claim 56, has been amended to recite "a point". Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding Claims 63 and 82, the term "major part" is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "major part" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Additionally, Claim 63 recites limitations drawn towards "the cross section of the needle". However, this limitation is improper as no "cross section" has been previously introduced in Claim 56 or Claim 63. The claim should cite reference to "a cross-section". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 56, 57, 61-64, and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 3,064,651 (“Henderson”).

Regarding Claim 56, Henderson discloses a needle (10) for penetrating a membrane having a pointed end (Figure 2) provided with a penetrating tip (Figure 3) and with an opening (13) for letting a liquid in and out in a main direction which is substantially parallel to the longitudinal extension of the needle (Figure 2). Henderson discloses that the penetrating tip is designed with a point (12) to initially prick a membrane when the membrane is penetrated and that the outer edges present on the pointed end in the area from the point to a position beyond the opening are rounded (Figure 6) so that after the initial penetration the pointed end will push the membrane material away rather than cutting the membrane material (Column 1, Lines 50-63; Column 2, Lines 22-46).

Regarding Claim 57, Henderson discloses that the inner edge of the opening is rounded (Figure 6).

Regarding Claim 61, Henderson discloses that the point of the penetrating tip is arranged to lie substantially on the longitudinal center line of the needle (when viewed

from Figure 2). It is held that the based on the language of the claims the point of the penetrating tip does not need to lie on the longitudinal center line when observed from all frames of reference.

Regarding Claims 62 and 81, Henderson discloses that the pointed end has a shape substantially corresponding to a part of an imaginary cone, the tip of which coincides with the point (Figure 3).

Regarding Claim 63, Henderson discloses that the opening (13) is formed such that a “major part” thereof is arranged on one and the same half of the cross-section of the needle (Figures 2 or 3). It is important to note that the cross-section of the needle may be assumed at any position.

Regarding Claim 64, Henderson illustrates the pointed end to be provided with a basic shape in accordance with a lancet bevel cut (Figure 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 58, 60, 76, 78-80, 82, and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 3,064,651 ("Henderson") as applied to Claim 56 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 2,697,438 ("Hickey").

Regarding Claim 58, 60, 76, 78, and 79, Henderson discloses the penetrating tip to be designed with a circular cross section having a symmetry (Figure 6 and Figure 2) at a longitudinal center line of the needle (when viewed from above as in Figure 2). However, Henderson fails to disclose that the point is on the longitudinal center line when observed from all viewing angles. However, Hickey discloses a needle (1) designed to prevent coring, a task mutually shared by the needle of Henderson. Hickey discloses that shape of the penetrating tip (Figure 2) of the needle should be altered such that the point (5) of the needle lies directly on the longitudinal center line (A) of the needle (Figure 2). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to alter the shape of the penetrating point of the needle of Henderson such that the point lies on the longitudinal axis when observed from all viewing angles, as disclosed by Hickey, thereby only achieving the expected results of providing a needle penetrating tip shape that is art recognized for preventing needle coring. While neither Henderson nor Hickey disclose the distribution of forces about the penetrating tip radiating from the longitudinal center line, it is held that the position of the modified point of Henderson in conjunction with the disclosed circular symmetry of the penetrating tip, that an infinite number of substantially equally sized forces in different

directions radial to the longitudinal center line would be produced, the forces counteracting one another such that the needle will tend not to deviate from the initial penetration direction when the needle penetrates a membrane. It is important to note that it is not possible for the Office to perform experimental testing of both Applicant's claimed invention and those in the prior art in order to definitively ascertain the exact distribution of forces. As such, Examiner must rely upon the claimed structure in order to differentiate whether or not the prior art is capable of satisfying the claimed functional language. As the device of Henderson, as modified by Hickey, discloses the same structure as claimed by Applicant, absent any explicit showing of evidence to the contrary, it is held that the prior art of Henderson and modified by Hickey is capable of satisfying the claimed functional language.

Regarding Claim 80, both Henderson and Hickey discloses the pointed end to have a shape substantially corresponding to part of an imaginary cone, the tip of which coincides with the point (Figure 3; Henderson) (Figure 2; Hickey).

Regarding Claim 82, both Henderson and Hickey discloses that the opening is formed such that a “major part” thereof is arranged on one and the same half of the cross-section of the needle (Figures 2 and 3; Henderson) (Figures 2 and 3; Hickey). It is important to note that the cross-section of the needle may be assumed at any position.

Regarding Claim 83, Henderson illustrates the pointed end to be provided with a basic shape in accordance with a lancet bevel cut (Figure 2)

8. Claims 59 and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 3,064,651 (“Henderson”) and US Patent No. 2,697,438 (“Hickey”)

as applied to Claim 58 of 76 above, and further in view of and US Patent No. 4,889,529 (“Haindl”).

Regarding Claims 59 and 77, Henderson in view of Hickey discloses the invention substantially as claimed except that the cross section is substantially triangular with rounded edges. However, Haindl discloses a needle (30) specifically designed as to be non-coring (Abstract). Haindl discloses that the needle should have a penetrating tip (Figure 5) having a cross section that is substantially triangular with rounded edges (33). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the cross section of the penetrating tip of the modified device of Henderson having a substantially triangular cross section with rounded edges, as disclosed by Haindl, thereby only achieving the expected results of providing a needle having a penetrating tip shape that is explicitly disclosed as preventing coring.

9. Claims 65 and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 3,064,651 (“Henderson”) as applied to Claim 56 or (“Henderson”) and US Patent No. 2,697,438 (“Hickey”) as applied to Claim 58 above, and further in view of and US Patent No. 5,515,871 (“Bittner”).

Regarding Claims 65 and 84, Henderson discloses the invention substantially as claimed except that pointed end is provided with a basic shape in accordance with a back bevel cut. However, Bittner discloses various needles (10, 2, and 30) having either a lancet bevel (Figures 3) or a back bevel (Figures 2), illustrating the two bevels to be obvious variants of one another. As such, it would have been obvious for one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the tip of the needle of Henderson to comprise a back bevel, as disclosed by Bittner, thereby only achieving the expected results of replacing one needle point end bevel with an art recognized alternative bevel.

10. Claims 66-69, 72, 73, and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 3,064,651 ("Henderson"), US Patent No. 5,515,871 ("Bittner"), and US Patent No. 2,697,438 ("Hickey") as applied to Claims 65 or 84 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 4,889,529 ("Haindl").

Regarding Claims 66, 68, 72, 73, and 86, Henderson in view of Bittner discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for explicitly disclosing the angle of the back bevel cut. However, Bittner does illustrate the back bevel cut to be to the order of 45 degrees (Figure 2B). Haindl illustrates a similar needle (60) which explicitly has a point bevel of 30 degrees (Figure 8). As such, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the modified needle of Henderson to include a beveled point of 30 degrees, as disclosed by Haindl, thereby only achieving the expected results of providing a well-known tip bevel angle to obtain a predictable outcome. It has been held that a value within a range anticipates said range.

Regarding Claims 67 and 69, Henderson in view of Bittner and Haindl discloses the invention substantially as claimed except that bevel cut has a tip angle in the interval of 50 to 100 degrees. However, one having ordinary skill in the art would reasonably recognize and appreciate that the tip angle is a result effective variable as established

by Bittner and more specifically Haindl. It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the bevel cut of the modified device of Henderson to be within an interval of 50 to 100 degrees and more specifically to approximately 75 degrees, since it has been held that discovering the optimum value of a result effective variable requires only routine and customary skill in the art.

11. Claims 70, 71, 74, 75, 85, and 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 3,064,651 ("Henderson") and US Patent No. 5,515,871 ("Bittner") as applied to Claim 65 above or US Patent No. 3,064,651 ("Henderson"), US Patent No. 5,515,871 ("Bittner"), and US Patent No. 4,889,529 ("Haindl") as applied to Claim 69 above or US Patent No. 3,064,651 ("Henderson"), US Patent No. 5,515,871 ("Bittner"), and US Patent No. 2,697,438 ("Hickey") as applied to Claim 84 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 6,517,523 ("Kaneko").

Regarding Claims 70, 71, 74, 75, 85 and 87, Henderson in view of Bittner and Haindl discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for disclosing the second grind angle of the back bevel cut. However, Kaneko discloses a needle (1) having a second grind angle of between at least 115 to 135 degrees (Figure 1C), thereby establishing the second grind angle as a result effective variable. However, Kaneko fails to explicitly disclose that the second grind angle is limited to the interval of 50 to 140 degrees, and more specifically to about 100 degrees. It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the second grind angle of the modified device of Henderson to comprise a second grind

angle of approximately 100 degrees, within the range suggested by Bittner, since it has been held that determining the optimum value for a result effective variable requires only routine skill in the art thereby only achieving the expected results of providing a suitable second grind angle for a needle to obtain a predictable outcome.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILLIAM CARPENTER whose telephone number is (571)270-3637. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:00AM-4:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Sirmons can be reached on (571) 272-4965. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/William Carpenter/
Examiner, Art Unit 3767
01/29/2009
/Kevin C. Sirmons/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3767